

NEWBERRY WAS G. O. P. FACTIONS INNOCENT, CLAIM IN HARD BATTLE

Secretary Hughes Explains Control of Party Within Michigan Senator's Conviction Wisconsin Develops Intensive Campaign

WASHINGTON, Aug. 21.—Secretary Hughes, in a letter made public by the Republican national committee, expresses the conviction after a review of the Newberry case "that Senator Newberry was wrongly and most unjustly convicted."

The secretary, writing to the Rev. Hugh B. McCauley, of Patterson, N. J., in response to an inquiry as to the "facts" in the Newberry case, gives in detail the findings of the committee, especially the supreme court, which set aside the conviction of Mr. Newberry and then concludes:

"Despite the long period of preparation, the chief investigation, the careful choosing of their ground, the long drawn out trial, the attempt in every possible way to besmirch, and the zeal, ability and even bitterness of his pursuers, their endeavor to establish a violation of law on the part of Senator Newberry completely failed, and accordingly Senator Newberry stood as a senator duly elected by the people of the state of Michigan and entitled to his seat in the senate of the United States."

NO CHARGES OF FRAUD
Mr. Hughes expresses the belief that there seems to be a general misconception of the nature of the litigation and its result, and Senator Newberry has suffered in consequence a most serious injustice.

"The conviction of Senator Newberry," he continues, "was obtained under a statute held by the majority of the supreme court to be invalid, rested upon a ground which did not involve any finding by the jury of moral turpitude; and was effected only by a most serious misconstruction of the statute which exposed him to conviction regardless of any moral offense upon his part and no matter how high minded he might have been in his conduct in the campaign."

The secretary, who as counsel for Mr. Newberry and his associates, participated in arguments in the case before the supreme court, further declares in his letter that it should be borne in mind that Senator Newberry's conviction in the lower court was not based on any charge of fraud or corruption or of the use of money for any illegal purpose or of any act involving moral turpitude.

EXCEEDED FUND LIMIT
Mr. Hughes then explains that the conviction of Mr. Newberry was based solely on the charge that there had been an expenditure in his campaign in excess of the limit fixed by the statute of the state of Michigan, and that the federal corrupt practices act made it unlawful for a candidate to spend in excess of the limit fixed by state law.

"Senator Newberry could not have been convicted," Mr. Hughes adds, "even upon this charge without what I always regarded, and so stated in my argument to the supreme court, as an extraordinary misapplication of the statute upon which the charge was based."

Discussing the decision of the supreme court at length, Mr. Hughes points out to his correspondent that the majority opinion of the court held that the federal statute was unconstitutional and therefore the conviction should be set aside and that the other four justices, while not concurring on the question of constitutionality, joined in reversing the judgment of conviction, "because the statute had been seriously misconstrued by the trial court."

TRAIN NOT FOR WAR BUT FOR PEACE-HARDING
(Continued From Page One)

physical being and I take it that you have not only had a wholesome time but that you are all returning to your normal pursuits better equipped for the tasks of life.

"You will be interested to know that the volunteer training movement last year enlisted about 11,000 recruits. This year there were 23,000 of you in the various camps. If I could have my wish this number would increase until more than 100,000 were annually studying and preparing for armed service, not that we ever expect to be called upon for such service, but solely for national defense and the preservation of the government under which we all live."

CONFIDENCE FOSTERED
"You know modern soldiery is very different from that of nearly all the history of the world. In olden times those who were in the profession compensated those in the pursuits of war. Our soldiering of today is solely for national defense and the preservation of that government under which we live."

"There is new assurance; there is new confidence; there is new belief in the perpetuity of this American republic when one can stand as I have stood this morning and noted such a company of ready volunteer defenders as you have shown us in this review. Again my congratulations and my gratitude for your country."

PRISONS TOO PLEASANT IS ENRIGHT VIEW
(Continued from Page One)

ed while over there, it will become an international clearing house. "Checking criminal anarchy through immigration control, is one of the most important phases; for most of the crime of this sort during the last ten years, including the Wall street bombing in which 29 were killed two years ago, has gone unpunished."

Commissioner Enright, a man of great bulk, with a shaggy head of curly gray hair, was promoted five years ago out of the ranks to the command of New York's 11,000 policemen.

"Yes, there is less crime generally," he said, "but bad liquor is the cause of many major crimes. I can't hazard a guess what prohibition's effect will be on criminality—because real prohibition has not arrived. How can it, when—as the poll of a popular magazine says, half the people are against it?"

MADISON, Wis., Aug. 21.—(By the Associated Press).—Control of the Republican party in Wisconsin is the objective of opposing factions now waging primary campaigns in the state history. Virtually no activity is being shown by the Democratic, Socialist or Prohibition parties.

Republicans are staging a repetition of the fight that has been carried on for the past 25 years between the faction headed by Senator Robert M. LaFollette and his opponents, organized this year under the committee of Progressive and Independent Republicans.

Politicians are finding a responsive state, the voters turning out in almost unprecedented numbers to hear candidates.

Appeal to the farmers and laboring men is being made by both factions. Attack on the Esch-Cummins law, the ship subsidy bill, the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill and on the federal reserve system is the method of approach used by the LaFollette faction, while their opponents headed by Dr. W. A. Ganfield are urging tax exemption on newly developed farm lands and proposing a system of farm loans under state supervision, besides favoring federal action to provide assistance to the agricultural interests.

The state federation of labor representing 60,000 wage earners of the state, did not indicate the candidacy of Senator LaFollette at its convention in July, but was appealed to by speakers to throw its support to the senior senator from Wisconsin. Organization of farm-labor leagues throughout the state was undertaken by the federation of labor to bring a political coalition between these two groups.

Meeting of these new political organizations in congressional districts have in each instance endorsed Senator LaFollette and the ticket headed by him.

The endorsement of LaFollette by the Wisconsin Socialist party has brought criticism from other state organizations of that party, and has caused an attack to be made by his opponents within the Republican party, on the senator, Dr. Ganfield, has asked him if he accepts this Socialist support, but has received no reply.

This contest between the two opposing Republican factions is being carried on by two tickets of candidates for state offices, two tickets of congressional candidates, down through state senatorial and assembly districts, complete control of the political machinery of the state is the object of the fight.

LIQUOR ISSUE IS PROMINENT
In the contest for renomination as Republican candidates for governor is the only dividing element between the two factions. Mayor A. C. McHenry of Oshkosh has entered the field and is making an active campaign as the candidate favoring modification of the Volstead act. Governor J. J. Blaine and Attorney General William J. Morgan, the two regular factional candidates, are fighting out their battles on the issues dividing the remainder of the ticket. Morgan is supported by the Anti-Saloon league, which has repeatedly attacked Governor Blaine and has been attacked by him.

The prohibition issue is growing in importance with the progress of the campaign. Mayor McHenry's campaign and the active exchange between the Anti-Saloon league and Governor Blaine have brought the division clearly before the people. The same fight is going on in each congressional district with the division between the LaFollette Progressives and Republicans and their opponents, and between those who favor modification of the Volstead act and those who believe in its strict enforcement.

With the primary election September 5, candidates are active in every section of the state. A general tour of Wisconsin is being made by representatives of each faction in an endeavor to reach voters of each section before the final weeks of the campaign.

THEATRES
Story of South Seas in "The Bonded Woman" at Alhambra

Want to go to the South Sea Isles? Nearly everybody does, since reading the books of Frederic O'Brien, W. S. Maugham and others. Patrons of the Alhambra theatre will find themselves carried away to that region when they see Betty Compson in "The Bonded Woman," her latest Paramount picture which plays there today, tomorrow and Wednesday.

In the confidential belief in the perpetuity of this American republic when one can stand as I have stood this morning and noted such a company of ready volunteer defenders as you have shown us in this review. Again my congratulations and my gratitude for your country."

CLAUDE MOYES, WEBER COUNTY CLERK, IS DEAD
(Continued from Page One)

was made this morning at the regular meeting of the county board of commissioners. Immediate action was taken to obtain bond and have Mr. Van Dyke take oath of office in order that the work of the county clerk's office might proceed. Mr. Van Dyke has been in charge of the office during the illness of Mr. Moyes and for years has handled the auditing work of the office. He has served as chief deputy under five county clerks.

J. A. Browning
A perfect spine is a perfect health.
Rooms 309 and 310, First National Bank Building Phone 592.

"A ROUGH EXTERIOR BUT WITH A HEART AS BIG AS ALL OUTDOORS"



BRITONS FEEL GRAVE ALARM

Manchurian Chief Threatens Boycott or More Severe Action

PEKING, Aug. 21.—(By the Associated Press).—Grave alarm is felt by British subjects throughout Manchuria after the threat of Chang Tso-Lin, governor of the province, to withhold his protection of British life and property in reprisal for what he calls British contempt of his authority. Chang declared the Manchurians are contemplating a boycott of British business and says he will not be responsible for action taken by the people if the present methods of British subjects in Manchuria continue.

The text of Chang's speech publicly attacking the Britons was published in today's newspapers. On August 12, in today's newspapers, Chang invited several American and British merchants to his headquarters in Mukden. There in the presence of Americans he bitterly attacked the Britons. During the course of his speech the Manchuria governor made three specific charges against the Britons.

REASONS SET FORTH
First, he declared that in a war between himself and Wu Pei Fu, the northern military leader, who defeated Chang and revived the old republican parliament, Manchurian soldiers were killed with bombs hurled from British airplanes.

Second, Chang charged the British have been opposing his seizure of the railroad extending from Shanghai-Kuan to Mukden, whereas they have not protested the capture of Peking.

In the third instance, Chang asserted, the British were opposing his seizure of the salt revenues of Manchuria, thus discriminating in favor of other nations who hold revenue.

"If you continue to treat me with contempt," Chang told the British merchants, "I can no longer be responsible for protecting you and as for your goods, a severe loss will be met as a negative for most of the opposition."

Chang continued if the British method did not change, "the negative form of opposition would become a positive one and the physical force of several millions of people will combine and enter into the struggle."

WILL QUESTION KING
Chang declared he intended to address a telegram to the king of England, complaining of the methods of the British subjects in Manchuria, saying "if the British do not realize the nature of their conduct I must have recourse to telegraph their emperor and ask if their various actions are determined by the British government or the British minister."

In his speech Chang Tso-Lin made no reference to the Americans. It is supposed that the Americans were invited merely to hear what Chang had to say. This threat, coming from one of China's most powerful military governors, has created much concern in British circles in China. It is understood that the British legation here has instituted an investigation of the matter, preparatory to entering a protest.

'SCAB' CALL LEADS TO ARREST OF SIX
COUNCIL BLUFFS, Ia., Aug. 21.—Charged with violation of a federal restraining order by the use of the epithet "scab" and with attacking M. J. Panovich, an employee of the Union Pacific railroad, six former employees of the railroad company were arrested Sunday and held under bond after preliminary hearing before United States Commissioner W. A. Byers. George Rach, one of the six accused men, is charged directly with hurling a missile which struck Panovich on the back.

The dandelion is found as a weed in all parts of the world.

YOUTH FOUND AFTER SEARCH

'Mystery Orphan' Left on Doorstep 10 Years Ago Is Recovered

CHICAGO, Aug. 21.—Robert William Ross, known as the "mystery orphan," who on Friday was an heir to more than \$50,000 and who was legally pronounced a foundling on Saturday, today was speeding toward his real family in the east.

Ten years ago the child was left on the doorstep of the Guardian Home at Joliet, that his birth might be concealed. Later his mother revealed the secret to her family while on her death bed, and a search for the boy, which has continued for nine years in all parts of the United States, was begun.

When members of the family got in touch with the Guardian Home, they were told the boy had been sent to St. Vincent's orphanage in Chicago where it was learned he had been adopted by Mrs. Ethel Hand and taken to California where he was later adopted by Mrs. Hand's parents in San Francisco. Police Lieutenant William Ross and Mrs. Ross.

Tricked by their promise to the dying mother, members of the child's family after a court battle won their contention that the adoption in California was void as the boy had been illegally removed from Illinois. Then the child was returned to Chicago and turned to the custody of the asylum under a court ruling made Saturday which also deprived him of his status as sole heir to the \$50,000 estate of his foster parents. The asylum then sent him back to his mother's family.

CAR TAKES PLUNGE; ONE DEAD, TWO HURT
DENVER, Colo., Aug. 21.—One man was killed, another is believed to have lost his life and two others are perhaps fatally injured as a result of an automobile accident two miles west of Denver early this morning when the car in which they were riding skidded and plunged down an embankment into a creek.

Thomas Kelly, 30, of Solomon, Kan., was killed in the wreck and C. W. Weekie, 19, and Otto F. Pasbinder, 22, of the same town are believed to be injured fatally. T. Divan of Denver, driver of the car, has not been found. It is believed his body is buried in the creek, under the wrecked car. Police were called to assist in rescue work.

The tragedy marked a day and night of automobile accidents in and around Denver in which at least fifteen persons were injured, some of them seriously.

Tempting Gravity



Homer L. Holt, of Denver, takes a chance on Umbrella Rock at Lookout Mountain, Tenn., with a pair of bicycle skates. A plunge down a precipice and death await his overbalancing.

HOODED PARTY ENTERS CHURCH

Klansmen Hand Letter of Praise to Pastor in Seattle

TACOMA, Wash., Aug. 21.—Seven men, robed and hooded in the regalia of Ku Klux Klan, entered the McKinley park Christian church here Sunday night and handed a letter to Rev. Paul Reager, the pastor. The message recommended Reager for his efforts "to arouse his congregation to their duties in their use of the ballot."

The men then marched out and disappeared in waiting automobiles. **THOUSANDS INITIATED**
CHICAGO, Aug. 21.—Beneath the red glare from a blazing cross, what was said to be the nation's biggest class of new Ku Klux Klansmen—4500 candidates—was initiated in a huge field just outside of Chicago late Saturday night.

While thousands of voices chanted the surging roll of "Onward, Christian Soldiers," the candidates, still garbed in their working clothes, faced the cross surrounded by its white robed initiators and pledging their allegiance to the "invisible empire."

The mystic rites were held in a great field, thousands of automobiles being parked in a big circle, a quarter of a mile in diameter. It was estimated that 25,000 persons witnessed the ceremonies.

GREAT CAVE BOUGHT
SPRINGFIELD, Mo., Aug. 21.—The Ku Klux Klan has purchased a large tract of land including the big Percy's cave near here, it was announced by members of the local organization.

Officials said that the cave would be used for Klan ceremonies. The purchase price, it was announced, was \$40,000. Percy's cave is a point of interest to sightseers in the Ozarks.

driver of the car, has not been found. It is believed his body is buried in the creek, under the wrecked car. Police were called to assist in rescue work.

The tragedy marked a day and night of automobile accidents in and around Denver in which at least fifteen persons were injured, some of them seriously.

ARMY MEN MAY WORK IN STRIKE
Enlisted Troopers Checked as to Experience in Railroad Work

WASHINGTON, Aug. 21.—(By the Associated Press).—In order to be fully prepared for any demand that might be made upon it, in the present industrial situation, the war department is re-checking the occupational qualifications of the enlisted men of the army and compiling information, making quick action possible in the event that federal troops are called upon for duty in the coal or rail strike.

As a part of the department's general policy of preparedness, corps commanders are understood to have been requested to advise officials here how many men under their command have experience in railroad work and in what particular branch of railroad service each is most competent.

Thus far, no requests for federal troops have been received by the department in connection with either the coal or rail strikes, but Secretary Weeks and his advisors have taken the position that should a request come they should be prepared immediately to place all pertinent information before the president. The order regarding qualification of enlisted men in railroad work was said to be based wholly upon this desire for preparedness and to indicate no change of policy on the part of the federal government.

Orpheum Today

Hear the Wonderful New Robert Morton Organ

Mr. G. W. Hockenberger of Denver at the Console



Shows Start: 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 p. m.

ARMY MEN MAY WOMAN SHOOT AFTER QUARREL

Salesman Refused to Mother of Child, Told

NEW YORK, Aug. 21.—Mrs. Berlin told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband for four years. She said she was divorced from him in 1917, but believed that Schneider would never acknowledge a three-year-old child, which had been born to her, as his. Schneider and Mrs. Berlin went to the hotel on other guests told the police she had been separated from her husband